

January 10, 2016

Tinkertoys for the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -twisted D_4 TheoryOscar Chacaltana ^a, Jacques Distler ^b and Anderson Trimm ^c^a *ICTP South American Institute for
Fundamental Research,
Instituto de Física Teórica,
Universidade Estadual Paulista,
01140-070 São Paulo, SP, Brazil*^b *Theory Group and
Texas Cosmology Center
Department of Physics,
University of Texas at Austin,
Austin, TX 78712, USA*Email: `chacaltana@ift.unesp.br`Email: `distler@golem.ph.utexas.edu`^c *School of Physics and Astronomy
Center for Theoretical Physics
Seoul National University
Seoul 08826 KOREA**Fields, Gravity & Strings
Center for Theoretical Physics
of the Universe
Institute for Basic Sciences
Daejeon 34047 KOREA*Email: `atrimm@physics.utexas.edu`**Abstract**

Among the simple Lie algebras, D_4 is distinguished as the unique one whose group of outer-automorphisms is bigger than $\mathbb{Z}_2$. We study the compactifications of the D_4 (2,0) Theory on a punctured Riemann surface, C , with outer-automorphism twists around cycles of C lying in $\mathbb{Z}_3 \subset \text{Aut}(D_4) = S_3$. The resulting 4D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFTs have a number of new and interesting properties. As byproduct, we discover a *new* rank-1 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFT with flavour symmetry group $SU(4)$.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Twists: Abelian and non-Abelian	1
2.1	k -differentials	2
3	Tinkertoys	3
3.1	Regular punctures	3
3.2	Fixtures	3
3.3	Free-field fixtures	4
3.3.1	$(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector	4
3.3.2	(ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector	4
3.4	Interacting Fixtures	4
3.4.1	$(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector	4
3.4.2	(ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector	8
3.5	Gauge Theory Fixtures	9
3.5.1	$(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector	9
3.5.2	(ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector	12
4	Global symmetries and the superconformal index	13
4.1	$(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ twisted sector	14
4.2	(ω, ω, ω) twisted sector	14
5	A new rank-1 SCFT	15
6	The T_{G_2} SCFT	17
7	$Spin(8)$ gaugings of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT	19
8	Resolving the atypical punctures	20
	Acknowledgements	24
	Appendix A	25
A.1	Embeddings of $SU(2)$ in G_2	25
A.2	Projection matrices for $SO(8)$	25
A.3	Projection matrices for G_2	26

1. Introduction

In recent years, remarkable progress has been made in the study of $4D \mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal field theories by realizing them as partially-twisted compactifications of $6D (2,0)$ theories of type $j = A, D, E$ on a punctured Riemann surface, C [1–7]. In addition to ordinary $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauge theories, this class of theories (sometimes called “class $\mathcal{S}$ ”) contains many strongly-interacting SCFTs, with no known Lagrangian description. An even larger class of theories can be constructed by allowing twists, along nontrivial cycles of C , by the action of the outer-automorphism group of j [8, 9]. Doing so introduces a new class of (“twisted”) punctures, labeled by a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$, the Langlands-dual of the invariant subalgebra, $\mathfrak{g}^\vee \subset \mathfrak{j}$. It also introduces new (“twisted”) cylinders, with gauge groups, $H \subset G$. In [10–14], we studied the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted versions of these theories.

Among the surprising features of the twisted case is that not all boundaries of the moduli space of punctured curves correspond to weakly-coupled gauge theories. Rather, the gauge theory moduli space is, in general, a branched cover of $\overline{M}_{g,n}$, branched over the boundary, and certain components of the boundary of $M_{g,n}$ correspond to strongly-coupled gauge theories (*i.e.*, interior points in the gauge theory moduli space).

In the present work we turn to the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -twisted D_4 theory. D_4 is the unique case where the group of outer automorphisms is bigger than $\mathbb{Z}_2$: the full outer-automorphism group is S_3 . We studied the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted theory in [11]. For reasons explained in §2, studying the full nonabelian group of twists is too ambitious for the present work, so we content ourselves with the other abelian subgroup, $\mathbb{Z}_3 \subset S_3$.

Perhaps the most interesting byproduct of this work is the construction of a new isolated rank-1 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFT, in §5. The theory has global symmetry $SU(4)_{14}$, and a 1-dimensional Coulomb branch parameterized by u , where $\Delta(u) = 6$.

2. Twists: Abelian and non-Abelian

The outer automorphism groups of the ADE Lie algebras are $\mathbb{Z}_2$ for $J = A_{N-1}$, $D_{N>4}$ and E_6 . But, for $J = D_4$, the group of outer automorphisms is the nonabelian group S_3 .

When compactifying the $(2,0)$ theory of type J on C , we can twist the compactification by an element of $Hom(\pi_1(C), Aut(J))$. When $Aut(J)$ is abelian, the homomorphism factors through $H_1(C)$ and so the possible twists are classified by $Hom(H_1(C), \mathbb{Z}_2) = H^1(C, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Our tinkertoy program has been based on chopping C up into simple pieces (3-punctured spheres and cylinders) and classifying the possible theories corresponding to the pieces. This works well, even in the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted case, essentially because there is a Mayer-Vietoris principle for $H^1(\bullet, \mathbb{Z}_2)$: one can understand the twisted theories on C by understanding the twists of the component pieces of C .

This is no longer true in nonabelian case. There is no Mayer-Vietoris principle for $Hom(\pi_1(C), S_3)$, and this makes our classification strategy ineffective.

A simple example of the problem will suffice. We can form a genus-2 surface by gluing together two once-punctured tori along a circle S . The twist γ around this (homologically trivial, but homotopically nontrivial) cycle must be trivial in the abelian case but can be *nontrivial* in the nonabelian case. (For S_3 , you can prove that γ has order-3.)

But now think about constructing those once-punctured tori by taking a 3-punctured sphere and gluing two of the punctures together.

You might think that, if you want to sew them together, the twists around the two punctures must be inverses of each other (ie γ_1 and $(\gamma_1)^{-1}$). And you would be *correct*. You might also think that, on an *unsewn* 3-punctured sphere, if two of the twists are γ_1 and $(\gamma_1)^{-1}$, then the 3rd twist must be trivial. Again, you would be *correct*. However, as soon as you connect the two punctures, you introduce a new cycle and the corresponding twist (γ_2) . Because S_3 is non-abelian, the twist around the remaining puncture can now be nontrivial (it is equal to the group commutator $(\gamma_2)^{-1}(\gamma_1)^{-1}\gamma_2\gamma_1$).

In short, just because the product of the three twists on the 3-punctured sphere is trivial does *not* mean that the twist around the puncture on a 1-punctured torus has to be trivial. Sewing together 3-punctured spheres does *not* capture the twist information you need to construct higher-genus surfaces – essentially because there’s no Mayer-Vietoris for homotopy.

Because of this difficulty, we will not attempt to study the full S_3 -twisted D_4 theory in this paper (see, however, [8, 15] for some preliminary work in this direction). Instead, we will focus on abelian subgroups of twists. In [11], we studied the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \subset S_3$ twists of the D_4 theory. Here we will study the $\mathbb{Z}_3 \subset S_3$ twists.

As this subgroup of twists is abelian, they are classified by $H^1(C, \mathbb{Z}_3)$. Denoting the generator of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ by ω (we’ll use a multiplicative notation for $\mathbb{Z}_3$), the twisted 3-punctured spheres will (up to permutations of the punctures or replacing $\omega \leftrightarrow \omega^2$) come in two types: $1 - \omega - \omega^2$ and $\omega - \omega - \omega$. A twisted cylinder connects a puncture of type ω with a puncture of type ω^2 .

Recall that one of the complications of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted D_N theories (for N even) was that the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ outer automorphism acted nontrivially on the set of nilpotent orbits of the untwisted theory. In particular [11] the two nilpotent orbits (which we denoted in red and blue) corresponding to a very-even partition are exchanged by the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action. This led to an additional ramification of the moduli space of the gauge theory: dragging a very-even puncture around a twisted puncture changed it from red to blue (and vice versa).

The same is true for the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ twist, except that there is a triple of punctures (which we denote by red, blue and green) which are cyclically permuted by dragging them around a twisted puncture¹.

2.1. k -differentials

Just as the k -differentials ϕ_4 and $\tilde{\phi}_4$ provide an eigenbasis of 4-differentials for the action of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{green}}$, there is a corresponding eigenbasis of 4-differentials for the action of the two non-trivial elements of $\mathbb{Z}_3$, ω and ω^2 .

We denote this basis of k -differentials by $\{\phi_2, \phi_4^{(\omega^2)}, \phi_4^{(\omega)}, \phi_6'\}$, where:

¹The particular $\mathbb{Z}_2$ outer automorphism of D_4 that we studied in [11] was the one that preserved the vector representation while exchanging the two spinor representations. We might call this $\mathbb{Z}_2 \subset S_3$, “ $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{green}}$ ”. We could equally-well have considered a $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{red}}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{blue}}$ subgroup of S_3 .

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_4^{(\omega^2)} &\equiv \phi'_4 - 2\sqrt{3}i\tilde{\phi}_4 \\
\phi_4^{(\omega)} &\equiv \phi'_4 + 2\sqrt{3}i\tilde{\phi}_4 \\
\phi'_6 &\equiv \phi_6 - \frac{1}{6}\phi_2\phi'_4
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

and $\phi'_4 \equiv \phi_4 - \frac{1}{4}(\phi_2)^2$. Correspondingly, we label the pole structure as $\{p_2, p_4^{(\omega^2)}, p_4^{(\omega)}, p'_6\}$.

3. Tinkertoys

3.1. Regular punctures


The table of ω -twisted punctures is the following.

Nahm pole	Hitchin Pole	Pole structure	Constraints	Flavour Group	$(\delta n_h, \delta n_v)$
0	G_2	$\{1, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{11}{3}, 5\}$	—	$(G_2)_8$	(112, 107)
A_1	$(G_2(a_1), S_3)$	$\{1, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{8}{3}, 5\}$	-	$SU(2)_{14}$	(102, 100)
$\tilde{A}_1$	$(G_2(a_1), \mathbb{Z}_2)$	$\{1, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{8}{3}, 5\}$	$c_5^{(6)} = 8\sqrt{2}a_{5/3}^{(2)} \left(64 \left(a_{5/3}^{(2)} \right)^2 + c_{10/3}^{(4)} \right)$	$SU(2)_5$	(93, 92)
$G_2(a_1)$	$G_2(a_1)$	$\{1, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{8}{3}, 5\}$	$c_{10/3}^{(4)} = -48 \left(\left(a_{5/3}^{(2)} \right)^2 + 3 \left(a_{5/3}'^{(2)} \right)^2 \right)$ $c_5^{(6)} = 128\sqrt{2}a_{5/3}^{(2)} \left(\left(a_{5/3}^{(2)} \right)^2 - 9 \left(a_{5/3}'^{(2)} \right)^2 \right)$	—	(88, 88)
G_2	0	$\{1, \frac{7}{3}, \frac{8}{3}, 4\}$	$c_{8/3}^{(4)} = -6 \left(a_{4/3}^{(2)} \right)^2$ $c_{7/3}^{(4)} = c_1^{(2)} a_{4/3}^{(2)}$ $c_4^{(6)} = -8 \left(a_{4/3}^{(2)} \right)^3$ $c_3^{(6)} = \frac{1}{54} \left(c_1^{(2)} \right)^3 + 2a_{4/3}^{(2)} c_{5/3}^{(4)}$	—	(48, 49)


The ω^2 -twisted punctures are the same, but with $p_4^{(\omega^2)} \leftrightarrow p_4^{(\omega)}$.

3.2. Fixtures

In the following, we denote twisted punctures by their Bala-Carter labels and untwisted punctures by the corresponding partitions. Punctures in the ω -twisted sector are in light-grey; punctures in the ω^2 -twisted sector are in dark-grey. We use  as a stand-in for the triple



of untwisted punctures and  as a stand-in for the triple



which are permuted by the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ action.

3.3. Free-field fixtures

3.3.1. $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector

#	Fixture	Number of hypers	Representation
1		0	empty
2		3	$\frac{1}{2}(3, 2)$
3		0	empty







3.3.2. (ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector

None.




3.4. Interacting Fixtures

3.4.1. $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector



#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
1		$(0, 0, 6, 4)$	$(112, 86)$	$Spin(8)_{12} \times (G_2)_8^2$
2		$(0, 0, 5, 4)$	$(102, 79)$	$Spin(8)_{12} \times (G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
3		$(0, 0, 4, 4)$	$(92, 72)$	$Spin(8)_{12} \times SU(2)_{14}^2$
4		$(0, 0, 6, 3)$	$(96, 75)$	$SU(2)_8^3 \times (G_2)_8^2$
5		$(0, 0, 5, 3)$	$(86, 68)$	$SU(2)_8^3 \times (G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
6		$(0, 0, 4, 3)$	$(76, 61)$	$SU(2)_8^3 \times SU(2)_{14}^2$



#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
7		$(0, 0, 5, 3)$	$(88, 68)$	$Sp(2)_8 \times (G_2)_8^2$
8		$(0, 0, 4, 3)$	$(78, 61)$	$Sp(2)_8 \times (G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
9		$(0, 0, 3, 3)$	$(68, 54)$	$Sp(2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}^2$
10		$(0, 1, 4, 2)$	$(72, 55)$	$(G_2)_8^2 \times U(1)^2$
11		$(0, 1, 3, 2)$	$(62, 48)$	$(G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14} \times U(1)^2$
12		$(0, 1, 2, 2)$	$(52, 41)$	$SU(2)_{14}^2 \times U(1)^2$

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
12		$(0, 0, 4, 3)$	$(79, 61)$	$SU(2)_7 \times (G_2)_8^2$
13		$(0, 0, 3, 3)$	$(69, 54)$	$SU(2)_7 \times (G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
14		$(0, 0, 2, 3)$	$(59, 47)$	$SU(2)_7 \times SU(2)_{14}^2$
15		$(0, 0, 3, 1)$	$(48, 32)$	$SU(2)_8 \times (G_2)_8^2$
16		$(0, 0, 2, 1)$	$(38, 25)$	$SU(2)_8 \times (G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
17		$(0, 0, 1, 1)$	$(28, 18)$	$SU(2)_8 \times Sp(2)_{14}$

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
18		$(0, 0, 2, 1)$	$(40, 25)$	$(G_2)_8^2$
19		$(0, 0, 1, 1)$	$(30, 18)$	$(G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}$
20		$(0, 0, 0, 1)$	$(20, 11)$	$SU(4)_{14}$

3.4.2. (ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
1		$(0, 0, 7, 4)$	$(112, 93)$	$(G_2)_8^3$
2		$(0, 0, 6, 4)$	$(102, 86)$	$(G_2)_8^2 \times SU(2)_{14}$

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	(n_h, n_v)	G_{global}
3		$(0, 0, 5, 4)$	$(92, 79)$	$(G_2)_8 \times SU(2)_{14}^2$
4		$(0, 0, 4, 4)$	$(82, 72)$	$SU(2)_{14}^3$

3.5. Gauge Theory Fixtures

The punctures $G_2, G_2(a_1)$, and $\tilde{A}_1$ are atypical punctures, in the sense that they contribute $d_2 > 1$ to the Coulomb branch dimension (they contribute $d_2 = 2, 3, 2$ respectively). As such, they ought to be “resolved” as the nonsingular OPE of two (or, in the case of $G_2(a_1)$, three) punctures.²

We can *partially* resolve $G_2(a_1)$, while staying within the sector of commuting twists: $G_2(a_1)$ is the nonsingular OPE of G_2 with the simple puncture, $[5, 3]$, from the untwisted sector.

However, resolving G_2 requires leaving the tractable subset of commuting twists. G_2 is the OPE of two simple punctures from non-commuting $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twisted sectors

$$G_2 \sim [6]_v \cdot [6]_s$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{A}_1 \sim [6]_v \cdot [4, 1^2]_s$$

This poses a conundrum. If we want to explore the full structure of the space of theories which include these punctures, we need to consider the full nonabelian S_3 group of twists. If we don’t, we are stuck with including the unresolved gauge theory fixtures. With the exception of §8, we will restrict ourselves to commuting twists and hence will leave these atypical punctures unresolved.

3.5.1. $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ -Twisted Sector

There are 50 gauge theory fixtures, and one more with with an irregular puncture







²For more details, see [10].

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	G	Number of Hypers	Representation
1		$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)$	8	$(3; 2)$ $+(1; 2)$

Of the 50 with three regular punctures, those with enhanced global symmetry are






#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	G	(n_h, n_v)	Rep of $G_{\text{global}} \times G$	G_{global}
1		$(2, 0, 1, 0)$	$SU(2) \times Sp(2)$	$(29, 13)$	$\frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1, 1; 2, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 8_s, 1; 1, 4)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2; 1, 5)$	$Spin(8)_4 \times$ $Spin(8)_8 \times SU(2)_5$
2		$(3, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)^3$	$(24, 9)$	$\frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1, 1; 2, 1, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 8_v, 1; 1, 2, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 8_s; 1, 1, 2)$	$Spin(8)_4^3$
3		$(1, 0, 2, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(32, 17)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 2, 2; 4)$ $+[(E_7)_8 SCFT]$	$Spin(7)_8 \times SU(2)_8^3$
4		$(1, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(22, 10)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2; 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1, 1; 4)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 2, 1; 5)$	$Spin(8)_8 \times$ $SU(2)_5 \times SU(2)_1$
5		$(1, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(24, 10)$	$\frac{1}{2}(12; 4)$	$Spin(12)_8$

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	G	(n_h, n_v)	Rep of $G_{\text{global}} \times G$	G_{global}
6		$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)$	$(14, 3)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 12; 1) + \frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1; 2)$	$Spin(8)_4 \times Sp(6)_4$
7		$(2, 1, 2, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times Sp(2)$	$(34, 25)$	$\frac{1}{2}(2, 1; 5, 1) + \frac{1}{2}(1, 2; 1, 5) + (1, 1; 4, 1) + (1, 1; 1, 4) + [(E_6)_6 \text{ SCFT}]$	$SU(2)_5^2 \times U(1)^3$
8		$(3, 1, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$	$(29, 21)$	$\frac{1}{2}(2; 5, 1, 1) + (1; 4, 1, 1) + (1; 1, 2, 1) + (1; 4, 1, 3) + (1; 1, 2, 3)$	$SU(2)_5 \times U(1)^4$
9		$(4, 1, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)^3 \times SU(3)$	$(24, 17)$	$(2, 1, 1, 1) + (1, 2, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 2, 1) + (2, 1, 1, 3) + (1, 2, 1, 3) + (1, 1, 2, 3)$	$U(1)^6$
10		$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)$	$(15, 3)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 7, 2; 1) + \frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1, 1; 2)$	$Spin(8)_4 \times Sp(7)_2 \times SU(2)_7$
11		$(1, 0, 2, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(29, 17)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2; 5) + [(E_7)_8 \text{ SCFT}]$	$SU(2)_8 \times Spin(7)_8 \times SU(2)_5$

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	G	(n_h, n_v)	Rep of $G_{\text{global}} \times G$	G_{global}
12		$(2, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times SU(2)$	$(24, 13)$	$\frac{1}{2}(2, 1; 4, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 8_v; 4, 1)$	$SU(2)_8 \times Spin(8)_8$
13		$(1, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(19, 10)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 1, 2; 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(2, 2, 1, 1; 4)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 4, 1; 5)$	$SU(2)_8^2 \times$ $Sp(2)_5 \times SU(2)_1$
14		$(2, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2) \times SU(2)$	$(14, 6)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2; 1, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1; 2, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1; 1, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1; 2, 2)$	$SU(2)_4^5 \times SU(2)_2$
15		$(1, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2)$	$(21, 10)$	$\frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1; 4) + \frac{1}{2}(1, 2; 5)$	$Spin(8)_8 \times SU(2)_5$
16		$(2, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2) \times SU(2)$	$(16, 6)$	$\frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1; 2, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 8_s; 1, 2)$	$Spin(8)_4^2$
17		$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)$	$(11, 3)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 6; 1) + \frac{1}{2}(8_v, 1; 2)$	$Spin(8)_4 \times Sp(3)_5$

3.5.2. (ω, ω, ω) -Twisted Sector

There are 23 gauge theory fixtures. Those with enhanced global symmetry are

#	Fixture	(d_2, d_3, d_4, d_6)	G	Number of Hypers	Rep of $G_{\text{global}} \times G$	G_{global}
1		$(2, 0, 2, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times Sp(2)$	$(29, 20)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 2; 5, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(7, 1; 1, 4)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1; 5, 4)$	$Spin(7)_8 \times SU(2)_5$
2		$(3, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$	$(24, 16)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1; 4, 2, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(8_v; 4, 1, 1)$	$Spin(8)_8$
3		$(1, 0, 1, 1)$	$Sp(3)$	$(28, 21)$	$\frac{1}{2}(4; 14)$	$Sp(2)_{14}$
4		$(2, 0, 1, 0)$	$Sp(2) \times SU(2)$	$(19, 13)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2; 1, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 3, 1; 1, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 1; 5, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(4, 1, 1; 5, 1)$	$Sp(2)_5 \times SU(2)_8 \times SU(2)_1$
5		$(3, 0, 0, 0)$	$SU(2)^3$	$(14, 9)$	$\frac{1}{2}(2, 1, 1, 1; 2, 2, 1)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 2, 1, 1; 2, 1, 2)$ $+\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, 2, 1; 1, 2, 2)$ $+(1, 1, 1, 2; 1, 1, 1)$	$SU(2)_4^3 \times SU(2)_2$

4. Global symmetries and the superconformal index

As we did for the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twisted sector of the D_4 theory in [11], to determine the number of free hypermultiplets in each fixture and the global symmetry of each SCFT, we use the Hall-Littlewood limit of the superconformal index [6, 16–19]. When C is a sphere, this limit of the index can be identified with the Hilbert series of the Coulomb branch of the $3d$ mirror of the $(2, 0)$ theory compactified on $C \times S^1$ [20, 21]. The $3d$ mirror of a D_4 fixture is obtained by assigning the $3d$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SCFT $T_\rho[\mathfrak{g}^\vee]$ to each puncture of type ρ (where for ρ of type 1, ω (or ω^2), $\mathfrak{g}^\vee = \mathfrak{so}(8)$, $\mathfrak{g}_2$, respectively), and gauging the diagonal $G^\vee$ flavor symmetry. The

expression for the Coulomb branch Hilbert series is then easily obtained following [22, 23]. The result for a fixture in each twisted sector is

4.1. $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ twisted sector

In this case, the superconformal index is given by

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{A}(\tau) \sum_{(a_1, a_2)} \frac{\mathcal{K}(\Lambda(a, \tau)) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(\Lambda(a, \tau)) \mathcal{K}(\Lambda(b, \tau)) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(\Lambda(b, \tau)) \mathcal{K}(\Lambda(c, \tau)) P_{SO(8)}^{(a_2, a_1, a_2, a_2)}(\Lambda(c, \tau))}{P_{SO(8)}^{(a_2, a_1, a_2, a_2)}(\Lambda([7, 1], \tau))}$$

4.2. (ω, ω, ω) twisted sector

In this case, the superconformal index is given by

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{A}(\tau) \sum_{(a_1, a_2)} \frac{\mathcal{K}(\Lambda(a, \tau)) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(\Lambda(a, \tau)) \mathcal{K}(\Lambda(b, \tau)) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(\Lambda(b, \tau)) \mathcal{K}(\Lambda(c, \tau)) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(\Lambda(c, \tau))}{P_{SO(8)}^{(a_2, a_1, a_2, a_2)}(\Lambda([7, 1], \tau))}$$

where (a_1, a_2) are the Dynkin labels of a finite-dimensional irreducible representation of G_2 and P_G^λ is a Hall-Littlewood polynomial of type G .³ Here, $\Lambda(a, \tau)$ denotes the fugacities associated to a puncture of type Λ , while $\Lambda([7, 1], \tau)$ denotes the fugacities associated to the trivial puncture.

An explicit expression for the Hall-Littlewood polynomials of type $SO(8)$ can be found in section 2.6 of [11]. The Hall-Littlewood polynomials of type G_2 are defined by

$$P_{G_2}^\lambda(x_1, x_2, x_3; \tau) = W_\lambda^{-1}(\tau) \sum_{\sigma \in D_6} x_1^{\sigma(\lambda_1)} x_2^{\sigma(\lambda_2)} x_3^{\sigma(\lambda_3)} \prod_{\alpha \in R^+} \frac{1 - \tau^2 x_1^{\sigma(-\alpha_1)} x_2^{\sigma(-\alpha_2)} x_3^{\sigma(-\alpha_3)}}{1 - x_1^{\sigma(-\alpha_1)} x_2^{\sigma(-\alpha_2)} x_3^{\sigma(-\alpha_3)}} \quad (4.1)$$

Letting $\{e_i\}$ denote the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$, $R^+ = \{\alpha_1 e_1 + \alpha_2 e_2 + \alpha_3 e_3\}$ is the set of positive roots⁴, $\lambda = \lambda_1 e_1 + \lambda_2 e_2 + \lambda_3 e_3$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= -a_2, \\ \lambda_2 &= -a_1 - a_2, \\ \lambda_3 &= a_1 + 2a_2, \end{aligned}$$

where (a_1, a_2) are the Dynkin labels, and $x_i \equiv e^{e_i}$.

The Weyl group of G_2 is the dihedral group of order 12, which has presentation

$$D_6 = \langle r, s | r^2 = s^2 = (rs)^6 = 1 \rangle$$

³For a discussion of the Macdonald limit of the superconformal index of D_4 fixtures with $\mathbb{Z}_3$ twists, see [15].

⁴In this paper, we use the conventions of LieART [24].

where r, s acting on $\mathbb{R}^3$ can be represented as

$$r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s = \begin{pmatrix} -1/3 & 2/3 & 2/3 \\ 2/3 & 2/3 & -1/3 \\ 2/3 & -1/3 & 2/3 \end{pmatrix}$$


The normalization factor $W_\lambda(\tau)$ is defined by

$$W_\lambda(\tau) = \sqrt{\sum_{\sigma \lambda = \lambda} \tau^{2\ell(\sigma)}}$$

where $\ell(\sigma)$ is the length of the Weyl group element σ . For $(a_1, a_2) = (0, 0)$, $W_{(0,0)}(\tau) = 1 + 2\tau^2 + 2\tau^4 + 2\tau^6 + 2\tau^8 + 2\tau^{10} + \tau^{12}$, for $(a_1, 0), (0, a_2), (a_1, a_1)$, $W_{(a_1,0)}(\tau) = W_{(0,a_2)}(\tau) = W_{(a_1,a_1)}(\tau) = 1 + \tau^2$, and for (a_1, a_2) , $W_{(a_1,a_2)}(\tau) = 1$.

5. A new rank-1 SCFT

We find a new rank-1 SCFT by compactifying the D_4 theory on



(5.1)

The resulting theory has an $SU(4)_{14}$ global symmetry, and trace-anomaly coefficients $(n_h, n_v) = (20, 11)$. The Coulomb branch is parametrized by a single complex scalar, with $\Delta(u) = 6$.


It is a little surprising that the Seiberg-Witten curve, $\Sigma \subset T^*C$,

$$0 = \lambda^2(\lambda^6 + \phi_6(z)), \quad (5.2)$$

with

$$\phi_6(z) = \frac{u_6 z_{12}^4 z_{13} z_{23} (dz)^6}{(z - z_1)^5 (z - z_2)^5 (z - z_3)^2}, \quad (5.3)$$

is reducible, even though the SCFT is not a product (of two SCFTs, or of an SCFT with free hypermultiplets). But this is not unprecedented. For instance, in the untwisted D_4 theory,



(5.4)

is a realization of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT (which has $(n_h, n_v) = (40, 11)$).

Its Seiberg-Witten curve is *also* given by (5.2), (5.3). However, the set of mass deformations (which transform as the Cartan of the global symmetry of the fixture⁵) is different.

The mass-deformed curve corresponding to (5.4) is

$$0 = \lambda^8 + \lambda^6 \phi_2(z) + \lambda^4 \phi_4(z) + \lambda^2 \phi_6(z) + \tilde{\phi}(z)^2 \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2(z) &= \frac{[m_2(z - z_1)z_{23} + m'_2(z - z_2)z_{13}] z_{12} (dz)^2}{(z - z_1)^2 (z - z_2)^2 (z - z_3)} \\ \phi_4(z) &= \frac{[(m_4(z - z_1)z_{23} - m'_4(z - z_2)z_{13})(z - z_3)z_{12} + \frac{1}{4}(m_2 + m'_2)^2(z - z_1)(z - z_2)z_{13}z_{23}] z_{12}^2 (dz)^4}{(z - z_1)^4 (z - z_2)^4 (z - z_3)^2} \\ \phi_6(z) &= \frac{[(m_6(z - z_1)z_{23} - m'_6(z - z_2)z_{13})(z - z_3)z_{12} + u_6(z - z_1)(z - z_2)z_{13}z_{23}] z_{12}^4 (dz)^6}{(z - z_1)^6 (z - z_2)^6 (z - z_3)^2} \\ \tilde{\phi}(z) &= \frac{[\tilde{m}_4(z - z_1)z_{23} - \tilde{m}'_4(z - z_2)z_{13}] z_{12}^3 (dz)^4}{(z - z_1)^4 (z - z_2)^4 (z - z_3)} \end{aligned}$$

It is useful to take the linear combinations defined in (2.1):

$$\phi'_4(z) = \frac{[(m_4 + \frac{1}{4}m_2^2)(z - z_1)z_{23} - (m'_4 + \frac{1}{4}m_2'^2)(z - z_2)z_{13}] z_{12}^3 (dz)^4}{(z - z_1)^4 (z - z_2)^4 (z - z_3)}$$

which (like $\tilde{\phi}(z)$) has at worst a simple pole at the simple puncture (here, located at z_3), and $\phi'_6(z) = \phi_6 - \frac{1}{6}\phi_2\phi'_4$. The latter, after mass-deforming, has a sextic pole at the untwisted full puncture but only a quintic pole at the twisted A_1 puncture.

In summary, mass-deforming the A_1 puncture in (5.1) allows $\phi_2(z)$ to have a double pole at the puncture, but *does not* change the pole orders of $\phi_4^{(\omega)}$, $\phi_4^{(\omega^2)}$ or ϕ'_6 . Hence, the mass-deformed SW curve for the $SU(4)_{14}$ SCFT has

$$\phi_2(z) = \frac{[m_2(z - z_1)z_{23} + m'_2(z - z_2)z_{13}] z_{12} (dz)^2}{(z - z_1)^2 (z - z_2)^2 (z - z_3)}$$

$\phi_6(z)$ as in (5.3), and $\phi'_4(z) = \tilde{\phi}(z) = 0$. That is, its mass deformations comprise a subspace of the space of mass deformations of (5.4).

On the basis of the Coulomb branch geometry alone, one would be hard-pressed to distinguish between the two theories. Nonetheless, they are obviously distinct. The Higgs branch of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT is 29-dimensional, whereas the Higgs branch of this new one is 9-dimensional. [25, 26] attempted to initiate a program of classifying rank-1 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFTs, based on their Coulomb branch geometry. As this example shows, such a classification may be incomplete.

⁵Only the mass deformations, corresponding to the Cartan of the *manifest* global symmetry of the fixture, are realizable in the Class-S realization. Thus we can realize only a 2-parameter family of mass deformations, even though $\text{rank}(SU(4)) = 3$.

The superconformal index of the $SU(4)_{14}$ SCFT is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(a, b; \tau) = & \frac{(1 - \tau^2)^2(1 - \tau^4)(1 - \tau^8)^2(1 - \tau^{12})}{(1 - \tau^2)(1 - \tau^2 a^{\pm 2})(1 - \tau^3 a^{\pm})(1 - \tau^3 a^{\pm 3})(1 - \tau^4)(1 - \tau^2)} \\ & \times \frac{1}{(1 - \tau^2 b^{\pm 2})(1 - \tau^3 b^{\pm})(1 - \tau^3 b^{\pm 3})(1 - \tau^4)(1 - \tau^4)^3(1 - \tau^6)(1 - \tau^8)^2} \\ & \times \sum_{(a_1, a_2)} \frac{P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(a\tau, 1, a^{-1}\tau; \tau) P_{G_2}^{(a_1, a_2)}(b\tau, 1, b^{-1}\tau; \tau) P_{SO(8)}^{(a_2, a_1, a_2, a_2)}(\tau^4, \tau^2, \tau^2, 1; \tau)}{P_{SO(8)}^{(a_2, a_1, a_2, a_2)}(\tau^6, \tau^4, \tau^2, 1; \tau)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

The order τ^2 expansion is given by

$$\mathcal{I}(a, b; \tau) := 1 + \chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{15}}(a, b)\tau^2 + \dots$$

where

$$\chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{15}}(a, b) = \chi_{SU(2)}^{\mathbf{3}}(a) + \chi_{SU(2)}^{\mathbf{3}}(b) + 2\chi_{SU(2)}^{\mathbf{2}}(a)\chi_{SU(2)}^{\mathbf{2}}(b) + 1$$

Thus, the manifest global symmetry $SU(2)_{14}^2$ is enhanced to $SU(4)_{14}$.

We can study the Hall-Littlewood chiral ring [7] of this theory by taking the plethystic log of (5.6). This gives

$$PL[\mathcal{I}] = \chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{15}}(a, b)\tau^2 + 2\chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{20}''}(a, b)\tau^3 + \chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{50}}(a, b)\tau^4 - 2\chi_{SU(4)}^{\mathbf{20}}\tau^5 - \dots \quad (5.7)$$

From the above expression, the Hall-Littlewood chiral ring is generated by operators in the **15** of $SU(4)$ at order 2, two sets of operators in the **20''** at order 3, and operators in the **50** at order 4. These operators are subject to two relations at order 5, both transforming in the **20** of $SU(4)$. There are also higher-order relations, which can be extracted from the higher-order terms in (5.7).

6. The T_{G_2} SCFT

In the untwisted compactifications of the $(2, 0)$ theories of type J , a prominent role is played by the “ T_J theory”, realized as the 3-punctured sphere with 3 full punctures. This theory has a $(J)_{2\kappa_J}^3$ global symmetry (κ_J is the dual Coxeter number) and is, in a certain sense, the generic fixture. In particular, the theory associated to a genus- $g \geq 2$ Riemann surface, C , without punctures, is a $(J)^{3g-3}$ gauging of $(2g - 2)$ copies of the T_J theory. Different pants-decompositions of C correspond to different S-duality frames of the gauge theory. The basic “move,” connecting the multitude of pants-decompositions, involves the three pants-decompositions of the 4-punctured sphere.

In the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted theories, the same is true, but we need to also consider 4-punctured spheres with 2 or 4 full punctures from the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted sector. Concomitantly, we encounter

the fixture with 2 full punctures from the twisted sector and 1 full puncture from the un-twisted sector:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \otimes \\ 0 \\ \otimes \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} \\
 \text{---} \\
 (G)_{2\kappa_G}^2 \times (J)_{2\kappa_J} \text{ SCFT}
 \end{array} \tag{6.1}$$

The basic duality (which allows one to pass between S-duality frames corresponding to different pants-decompositions of C) is


$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \otimes \\ 0 \\ \otimes \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} & \xleftrightarrow{J} & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} \\
 (G)_{2\kappa_G}^2 \times (J)_{2\kappa_J} \text{ SCFT} & & (J)_{2\kappa_J}^3 \text{ SCFT} \\
 & \Longleftrightarrow & \\
 & & \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \otimes \\ 0 \\ \otimes \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} \\ \uparrow G \\ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \otimes \\ 0 \\ \otimes \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \circ \end{array} \end{array} \\
 & & (G)_{2\kappa_G}^2 \times (J)_{2\kappa_J} \text{ SCFT}
 \end{array}$$

(and a similar one, on the sphere with 4 twisted punctures, involving a J -gauging of two copies of (6.1)).


In the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -twisted D_4 theory, we have, similarly,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \bullet \\ 0 \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 (G_2)_8^2 \times \text{Spin}(8)_{12} \text{ SCFT} & & (G_2)_8^3 \text{ SCFT} \\
 & & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \bullet \end{array} \\
 & & (G_2)_8^3 \text{ SCFT}
 \end{array}$$

The basic dualities are



and



and similarly for a 4 punctured sphere with one untwisted puncture and three twisted punctures from the *same* twisted sector. The latter relate different G_2 gaugings of a product of the $(G_2)_8^3$ SCFT and the $(G_2)_8^2 \times Spin(8)_{12}$ SCFT.

7. $Spin(8)$ gaugings of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT

There are three inequivalent index-2 embeddings of $Spin(8)$ in E_8 . They can be characterized by how the 248 decomposes (up to outer automorphisms of $Spin(8)$). Either

$$248 = 3(1) + 5(28) + 35_v + 35_s + 35_c \quad (7.1a)$$


or

$$248 = 1 + 2(8_v) + 3(28) + 35_v + 2(56_v) \quad (7.1b)$$

or

$$248 = 8_v + 8_s + 8_c + 2(28) + 56_v + 56_s + 56_c \quad (7.1c)$$

We can use one of these embeddings to gauge a $Spin(8)$ subgroup of the global symmetry group of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT. The case of (7.1a) is realized in the untwisted D_4 theory as the once-punctured torus



The gauge theory moduli space is the fundamental domain for $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ in the UHP, and τ is the modular parameter of the torus.


As discussed in section 4.3 of [11], the case of (7.1b) is realized in the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted D_4 theory. The S-dual theory is an $Sp(3)$ gauging of the $Sp(6)_8$ SCFT.

What about (7.1c)? That gauging can be realized in the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -twisted D_4 theory, considered here. We have $H^1(T^2 - p, \mathbb{Z}_3) = (\mathbb{Z}_3)^2$ and the action of $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ consists of two orbits: the zero-orbit (corresponding to the untwisted theory) and the nonzero-orbit. The gauge theory moduli space is the fundamental domain for the index-8 subgroup, $\Gamma_1(3) \subset PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, which is the moduli space of pairs, (C, γ) , where γ is a nonzero element of $H^1(T^2 - p, \mathbb{Z}_3)$. The S-dual description⁶ is a G_2 gauging of the $(G_2)_8^2$ SCFT (interacting fixture 18).

8. Resolving the atypical punctures

As we have emphasized above, resolving the atypical punctures $(G_2, G_2(a_1))$ and $\tilde{A}_1$, from the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ twisted sector, requires stepping out of the world of commuting twists. Generically, this leads to a mess which resists any simple “tinkertoy”-like classification. But, occasionally, one is lucky and can carry out a reasonable analysis, despite the non-commuting nature of the twists. In this section, we will give one example where such an analysis can be done.


Consider the 4-punctured sphere



(8.1)

⁶To be a bit more precise, the fundamental domain for $\Gamma_1(3)$ has 3 cusp points, one of which corresponds to the point where the $Spin(8)$ gauging (7.1c) of the $(E_8)_{12}$ SCFT becomes weakly-coupled. The other two of correspond to points where a G_2 gauging of the $(G_2)_8^2$ SCFT becomes weakly-coupled.

Each G_2 puncture resolves into a pair of simple punctures from non-commuting $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted sectors. With a small loss of generality, we can therefore write this as the 6-punctured sphere




where we have attached a label(v or s) to each twisted puncture, to indicate which $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup of S_3 the twist belongs to.

The resulting theory is three decoupled copies of $SU(2)$ with 4 fundamentals. As such, we should be able to write down expressions for the $f(\tau_i)$ as functions on a branched cover of $\overline{M}_{0,6}$, branched over the compactification divisor. Unfortunately, this is too hard. It is easier, instead, to consider the j -invariant, $j(\tau_i)$, where

$$j(\tau) = \frac{4(f(\tau)^2 - f(\tau) + 1)^3}{27f(\tau)^2(1 - f(\tau))^2} \quad (8.2)$$

We get a weakly-coupled gauge theory for $f(\tau) = 0, 1, \infty$; $j(\tau)$ has a double pole at all three of these points. Conversely, $j(\tau)$ has a triple zero at $f(\tau) = -\omega, -\omega^2$ (where $\omega^3 = 1$), and it is normalized so that $j(\tau) = 1$ for $f(\tau) = -1, 1/2, 2$. So we seek three functions on a branched cover of $\overline{M}_{0,6}$ with double poles along appropriate components of the boundary and whose only zeroes are triple zeroes.

As a warmup, let us recall the example of section 5.1.2 of [10]. There, we obtained $(SU(N) + 2N(\square))^2$ gauge theory as the 5-punctured sphere



in the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -twisted A_{2N-1} theory. Let

$$y_1^2 = \frac{z_{13}z_{25}}{z_{15}z_{23}}, \quad y_2^2 = \frac{z_{14}z_{25}}{z_{15}z_{24}}$$

which are single-valued on a 4-fold branched cover $X_5 \rightarrow \overline{M}_{0,5}$. In [10], we showed that the gauge couplings

$$f(\tau_1) = \frac{y_1 - 1}{y_1 + 1} \frac{y_2 - 1}{y_2 + 1}, \quad f(\tau_2) = \frac{y_1 - 1}{y_1 + 1} \frac{y_2 + 1}{y_2 - 1} \quad (8.3)$$

Here, $f(\tau) = 0, \infty$ is the weakly-coupled $SU(N)$ gauge theory; $f(\tau) = 1$ is a weakly-coupled $SU(2)$ gauging of $1(2) + R_{2,N}$ SCFT. The corresponding j -invariants are

$$j(\tau_1) = \frac{[(1 + y_1 y_2)^2 + 3(y_1 + y_2)^2]^3}{27(y_1^2 - 1)^2 (y_2^2 - 1)^2 (y_1 + y_2)^2} \quad (8.4)$$

(and $j(\tau_2)$ is given by $y_2 \rightarrow -y_2$ in the above expression). For this family of gauge theories, where the physics is *not* invariant under the S_3 which exchanges $f = 0, 1, \infty$, the j -invariant is not a particularly useful parameter (as inequivalent theories can have the same j -invariant). But, for $SU(2) + 4(2)$, S_3 is a symmetry and the j -invariant uniquely labels inequivalent theories.

Now, the $j(\tau_i)$ in (8.4) are still functions on the branched cover $X \rightarrow \overline{M}_{0,5}$. But $j(\tau_1)j(\tau_2)$ is (the pullback of) a meromorphic function on $\overline{M}_{0,5}$:

$$j(\tau_1)j(\tau_2) = \frac{[(x_1 x_2 + 4(x_1 + x_2))^2 - 48x_1 x_2]^3}{729x_1^4 x_2^4 (x_1 - x_2)^2} \quad (8.5)$$

where

$$x_1 = y_1^2 - 1 = \frac{z_{12}z_{35}}{z_{15}z_{23}}, \quad x_2 = y_2^2 - 1 = \frac{z_{12}z_{45}}{z_{15}z_{24}}$$

Returning to (8.1), we can count the number of $SU(2)$'s which become weakly coupled at each irreducible component of the boundary of $M_{0,6}$. The boundary consist of 15 divisors, D_{ij} , where two punctures collide, and 10 divisors, D_{ijk} , where three punctures collide. Of course, having three of the six punctures collide is conformally equivalent to having the other three collide; so $D_{123} \simeq D_{456}$, etc. The D_{ij} are del Pezzo surfaces, dP_4 ; the $D_{ijk} \simeq \mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$.

We find

Divisor	Weakly-coupled gauge group
D_{12}	$SU(2)$
D_{34}	$SU(2)$
D_{13}	$\emptyset$
D_{23}	$\emptyset$
D_{14}	$\emptyset$
D_{24}	$\emptyset$
D_{15}	$\emptyset$
D_{25}	$\emptyset$

Divisor	Weakly-coupled gauge group
D_{35}	$\emptyset$
D_{45}	$\emptyset$
D_{16}	$SU(2)^3$
D_{26}	$SU(2)^3$
D_{36}	$SU(2)^3$
D_{46}	$SU(2)^3$
D_{56}	$SU(2)^3$
D_{123}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{124}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{125}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{126}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{134}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{234}	$SU(2)^2$
D_{135}	$\emptyset$
D_{136}	$\emptyset$
D_{235}	$\emptyset$
D_{236}	$\emptyset$

“Normally,” precisely one simple factor in the gauge group becomes weakly-coupled at an irreducible component of the boundary. In this sense, only D_{12} and D_{34} are “normal.” All of the other components of the boundary are atypical.

Unlike the previous case, we don’t have a detailed understanding of $X_6 \xrightarrow{\pi} \overline{M}_{0,6}$, on which the gauge couplings are single-valued. The best we know how to do is to write down a formula for $j(\tau_1)j(\tau_2)j(\tau_3)$ which *we will assume*⁷ is (the pullback of) a single-valued meromorphic function on $\overline{M}_{0,6}$, whose only poles lie on those boundary divisors where some gauge couplings become weak, and whose zeroes are triple-zeroes. Moreover, it must be invariant under the action of the dihedral group, D_4 , with generators

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha: (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &\mapsto (z_1, z_2, z_4, z_3) \\
\beta: (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &\mapsto (z_2, z_1, z_3, z_4) \\
\gamma: (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &\mapsto (z_3, z_4, z_1, z_2)
\end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

Introducing the cross ratios

$$x_1 = \frac{z_{12}z_{36}}{z_{16}z_{32}}, \quad x_2 = \frac{z_{12}z_{46}}{z_{16}z_{42}}, \quad x_5 = \frac{z_{12}z_{56}}{z_{15}z_{26}}$$

the generators act as

⁷It is not totally obvious that this assumption is correct; nevertheless, the existence of a nice formula (8.7) lends it some credence.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha: \quad & x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2, \quad x_5 \rightarrow x_5 \\
\beta: \quad & x_1 \rightarrow \frac{x_1}{x_1 - 1}, \quad x_2 \rightarrow \frac{x_2}{x_2 - 1}, \quad x_5 \rightarrow \frac{x_5}{x_5 - 1} \\
\gamma: \quad & x_1 \rightarrow \frac{x_1 - x_2}{x_1(1 - x_2)}, \quad x_2 \rightarrow 1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1}, \quad x_5 \rightarrow -\frac{(x_1 - x_2)x_5}{x_2(x_1 + x_5 - x_1x_5)}
\end{aligned}$$

These conditions more-or-less pin down the desired expression. Normalizing $j(\tau_1)j(\tau_2)j(\tau_3) = 1$ at the point $D_{13} \cap D_{24} \cap D_{136}$ (and points related to it by the action of the dihedral group generated by (8.6)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
j(\tau_1)j(\tau_2)j(\tau_3) = & \frac{1}{531441 x_1^6 x_2^6 (x_1 - x_2)^{12} x_5^{12}} \cdot [16(x_1 - x_2)^2 + x_1^2 x_2^2 + 8x_1 x_2(2 - x_1 - x_2)]^3 \\
& \cdot [(x_1 - x_2)^2 + 16x_1^2 x_2^2 + 8x_1 x_2(2 - x_1 - x_2)]^3 \\
& \cdot [x_5^4(x_1 - x_2)^2 + s x_1 x_2(1 - x_5)(x_5 - x_1(x_5 - 1))(x_5 - x_2(x_5 - 1))]^3
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

with one unknown (nonzero) constant, s . This has

- triple zeroes along divisors in the *interior* of $M_{0,6}$,
- a 12th-order pole along $D_{12}, D_{34}, D_{56}, D_{123}, D_{124}, D_{134}, D_{234}, D_{126}, D_{346}$,
- a 6th-order pole along $D_{16}, D_{26}, D_{36}, D_{46}$
- and no other poles.

The orders of these poles gives us *some* information about the ramification of $X_6 \xrightarrow{\pi} \overline{M}_{0,6}$.

For instance, along D_{12} (and D_{34}), we expected a double pole (since one $SU(2)$ becomes weak), but obtained a 12th-order pole. So the ramification index must be 6. Along D_{16} (and D_{26}, D_{36} and D_{46}), we expected a 6th-order pole (since three $SU(2)$ s become weak) and — since that's what we obtained — the covering must be unramified there. Along D_{56} the ramification index appears to be 2 and, along $D_{123}, D_{124}, D_{134}, D_{234}, D_{126}$ and D_{346} ($= D_{125}$), the ramification index is 3.

Determining the constant s requires some knowledge of locations the zeroes of the $j(\tau_i)$, which is beyond our current abilities.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prarit Agarwal, Chris Beem, Michele del Zotto, Noppadol Mekareeya, Andy Neitzke, Yuji Tachikawa, and Fei Yan for helpful discussions. The work of J.D. was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-1316033. The work of A.T. was supported in part by the National Research Foundation of Korea grants

2005-0093843, 2010-220-C00003 and 2012K2A1A9055280. The work of O.C. was supported in part by the INCT-Matemática and the ICTP-SAIFR in Brazil through a Capes postdoctoral fellowship. J.D. would like to thank the Simons Center for Geometry and Physics for hospitality during the 2015 Simons Summer Workshop in Mathematics and Physics, where the bulk of this work was done.

Appendix A

A.1 Embeddings of $SU(2)$ in G_2

Bala-Carter	$\mathfrak{f}$	Embedding indices	7	14
A_1	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$(1, 3)$	$(1; 3) + (2; 2)$	$(1; 3) + (2; 4) + (3; 1)$
$\tilde{A}_1$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$(3, 1)$	$(2; 2) + (3; 1)$	$(1; 3) + (3; 1) + (4; 2)$
$G_2(a_1)$	—	4	$(1) + 2(3)$	$3(3) + (5)$
G_2	—	28	7	$(3) + (11)$

A.2 Projection matrices for $SO(8)$

Partition	$\mathfrak{f}$	Projection Matrix
$[2^2, 1^4]$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)^3$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$[3, 1^5]$	$\mathfrak{sp}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$[2^4]_{r,b}$	$\mathfrak{sp}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$[3^2, 1^2]$	$\mathfrak{u}(1)^2$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 4 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
$[3, 2^2, 1]$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$[5, 1^3]$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 6 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Partition	$\mathfrak{f}$	Projection Matrix
$[4^2]$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 6 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$[5, 3]$	—	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 6 & 4 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$
$[7, 1]$	—	$\begin{pmatrix} 6 & 10 & 6 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$

A.3 Projection matrices for G_2

Bala-Carter	$\mathfrak{f}$	Projection Matrix
A_1	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$\tilde{A}_1$	$\mathfrak{su}(2)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$G_2(a_1)$	—	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$
G_2	—	$\begin{pmatrix} 6 & 10 \end{pmatrix}$

References

- [1] D. Gaiotto, G. W. Moore, and A. Neitzke, “Wall-crossing, Hitchin systems, and the WKB approximation,” [arXiv:0907.3987 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] D. Gaiotto, “ $N = 2$ dualities,” *JHEP* **08** (2012) 034, [arXiv:0904.2715 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [3] L. F. Alday, D. Gaiotto, and Y. Tachikawa, “Liouville correlation functions from four-dimensional gauge theories,” *Lett.Math.Phys.* **91** (2010) 167–197, [arXiv:0906.3219 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] D. Gaiotto and J. Maldacena, “The gravity duals of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal field theories,” *JHEP* **10** (2012) 189, [arXiv:0904.4466 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “The superconformal index of the E_6 SCFT,” *JHEP* **1008** (2010) 107, [arXiv:1003.4244 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “The 4d superconformal index from q-deformed 2d Yang-Mills,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **106** (2011) 241602, [arXiv:1104.3850 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] C. Beem, W. Peelaers, L. Rastelli, and B. C. van Rees, “Chiral algebras of class S,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 020, [arXiv:1408.6522 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [8] Y. Tachikawa, “ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ S-duality via outer-automorphism twists,” *J. Phys.* **A44** (2011) 182001, [arXiv:1009.0339 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and Y. Tachikawa, “Nilpotent orbits and codimension-two defects of 6d $N = (2, 0)$ theories,” *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A28** (2013) 1340006, [arXiv:1203.2930 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and Y. Tachikawa, “Gaiotto duality for the twisted A_{2N-1} series,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 075, [arXiv:1212.3952 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and A. Trimm, “Tinkertoys for the twisted D-series,” *JHEP* **04** (2015) 173, [arXiv:1309.2299 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and A. Trimm, “Seiberg-Witten for $Spin(n)$ with spinors,” *JHEP* **08** (2015) 027, [arXiv:1404.3736 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and A. Trimm, “Tinkertoys for the twisted E_6 theory,” [arXiv:1501.00357 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] O. Chacaltana, J. Distler, and A. Trimm, “A family of 4D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ interacting SCFTs from the twisted A_{2N} series,” [arXiv:1412.8129 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] P. Agarwal and J. Song, “New $N = 1$ dualities from M5-branes and outer-automorphism twists,” *JHEP* **03** (2014) 133, [arXiv:1311.2945 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] J. Kinney, J. M. Maldacena, S. Minwalla, and S. Raju, “An index for 4 dimensional superconformal theories,” *Commun.Math.Phys.* **275** (2007) 209–254, [arXiv:hep-th/0510251 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] A. Gadde, E. Pomoni, L. Rastelli, and S. S. Razamat, “S-duality and 2d topological QFT,” *JHEP* **1003** (2010) 032, [arXiv:0910.2225 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “Gauge theories and Macdonald polynomials,” *Commun.Math.Phys.* **319** (2013) 147–193, [arXiv:1110.3740 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] M. Lemos, W. Peelaers, and L. Rastelli, “The superconformal index of class S theories of type D,” [arXiv:1212.1271](#).
- [20] F. Benini, Y. Tachikawa, and D. Xie, “Mirrors of 3D Sicilian theories,” *JHEP* **09** (2010) 063, [arXiv:1007.0992 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] D. Gaiotto and S. S. Razamat, “Exceptional indices,” *JHEP* **1205** (2012) 145, [arXiv:1203.5517 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] S. Cremonesi, A. Hanany, N. Mekareeya, and A. Zaffaroni, “Coulomb branch Hilbert series and Hall-Littlewood polynomials,” *JHEP* **1409** (2014) 178, [arXiv:1403.0585 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [23] S. Cremonesi, A. Hanany, N. Mekareeya, and A. Zaffaroni, “Coulomb branch Hilbert series and three dimensional Sicilian theories,” *JHEP* **1409** (2014) 185, [arXiv:1403.2384 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] R. Feger and T. W. Kephart, “LieART - a Mathematica application for Lie algebras and representation theory,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **192** (2015) 166–195, [arXiv:1206.6379 \[math-ph\]](#).
- [25] P. Argyres, M. Lotito, Y. Lü, and M. Martone, “Geometric constraints on the space of $N = 2$ SCFTs I: Physical constraints on relevant deformations,” [arXiv:1505.04814 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] P. C. Argyres, M. Lotito, Y. Lü, and M. Martone, “Geometric constraints on the space of $N = 2$ SCFTs II: Construction of special Kähler geometries and RG flows,” [arXiv:1601.00011 \[hep-th\]](#).